REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed July 24, 2008. Claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended. Claims 6 and 12 have been canceled without prejudice. No new matter is added. Claims 1-5 and 7-11 remain pending in the present application.

Applicant appreciates Examiner's careful review and consideration of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are, according to the Office action, not tied to another statutory class nor do they execute a transformation.

In response to this rejection, Applicant has amended claim 9 by adding a hardware device (i.e. a database server), for the purpose of overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. The amended claim 9 recites the use of a database server, thus, the process claimed in amended claim 9 is tied to another statutory class (such as a database server). Furthermore, the process claimed in the amended claim 9 can display manufacturing orders in a selectable sequence. Therefore, it is submitted that the technology embodied in the amended claim 9 produces a "useful, concrete and tangible" result, namely a sequential list of manufacturing orders. Claims 10-11 depend directly or indirectly on amended independent claim 9. Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 as to claims 9-11.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-2, 6, 8-9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Jenkins et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0188499, hereinafter referred to as Jenkins) in view of Crampton et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0177050).

Claims 3-5, 7, and 10 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Jenkins in view of Crampton as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Drolet et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0147622, hereinafter referred to as Drolet).

In response to these rejections, applicant has amended claims 1 and 9 by adding more limitations therein, at least for the purpose of overcoming these rejections.

Claims 1-8

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

"the priority revising module is used to ***revise designated priorities of manufacturing orders to account for particular contingencies that arise, and to satisfy particular requirements of customers*** (emphasis added)."

As indicated on page 3 of the Office action, Jenkins discloses that "[f]ive options on the automated load builder 310 dialog allow the user to define the priority for adding shipments to a partially filled load;" further discloses that "[t]he automated load builder 310 calculates a priority value for each recommended shipment between the source and the destination it is working with by adding values for rewards and subtracting values for penalties (paragraph [0270])."

Although Jenkins discloses features of "calculates a priority value" and "define the priority," Jenkins does not disclose a feature of "revise priorities". In the present application, the priority revising module is provided to *revise designated priories*. It is understood that, after a priority is calculated or defined, the priority may be need to be revised due to particular requirements of customers. However, Jenkins does not disclose or teach such feature which can revise priorities according to the requirements of customers.

Accordingly, Jenkins fails to teach or suggest the features of "***the priority revising module is used to revise designated priorities of manufacturing orders to account for particular contingencies that arise, and to satisfy particular requirements of customers***" as set forth in amended claim 1.

In addition, claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

"the sorting module is used to *display manufacturing orders in selectable sequences for users, wherein the selectable sequence comprises sequence according to the designated priority, the calculated priority, a scheduled manufacturing starting time, or a scheduled manufacturing completion time* (emphasis added)."

Applicant submits that Jenkins fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the above emphasized feature as set forth in amended claim 1. This submission is supported by the statement on page 3 of the Office action regarding what Jenkins does not specifically disclose in relation to claim 1 as originally filed.

Crampton discloses that "[t]he order sorting mechanism allows for modeling order groups and sorting criteria in such a way that the highest priority orders get processed first." Even assuming that Crampton discloses or teaches the feature of "displaying manufacturing orders according to priority," in the present application, the selectable sequences not only include sequence according to priority, but also include sequence according to a scheduled manufacturing starting time, or a scheduled manufacturing completion time. That is, the sorting module of the present application not only can display manufacturing orders according to priority, but also can display manufacturing orders according to a scheduled manufacturing starting time, or a scheduled manufacturing completion time. However, Crampton does not disclose or teach the features of "displaying manufacturing orders according to a scheduled manufacturing starting time, or a scheduled manufacturing completion time."

Accordingly, Crampton fails to teach or suggest the features of "the sorting module is used to *display manufacturing orders in selectable sequences for users, wherein the selectable sequence comprises sequence according to the designated priority, the calculated priority, a scheduled manufacturing starting time, or a scheduled manufacturing completion time* (emphasis added)" as set forth in amended claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, applicant submits that any combination of Jenkins and Crampton does not teach or even suggest the present invention having the above-described features as set forth in amended claim 1. That is, amended claim 1 is unobvious and patentable over Jenkins in view of Crampton under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 1 are requested.

Claims 2-5 and 7-8 depend directly on independent claim 1, and respectively recite additional limitations. Therefore, applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 2-5 and 7-8 and allowance of these claims.

Claims 6 has been canceled without prejudice, therefore, the rejection relating to thereto is now moot.

Claims 9-11

Claim 9, as amended, recites in part:

"*determining calculated priorities of the manufacturing orders in accordance with data on the manufacturing orders stored in the database server*;

revising designated priorities of the manufacturing orders to account for particular contingencies that arise, and to satisfy particular requirements of customers; and

displaying manufacturing orders in a selectable sequence, wherein the selectable sequence comprises sequence according to the designated priority, the calculated priority, a scheduled manufacturing starting time, or a scheduled manufacturing completion time (emphasis added)."

Referring to and incorporating herein the above reasons regarding the patentability of amended claim 1, applicant submits that any combination of Jenkins and Crampton does not teach or even suggest the invention having the above-described features as set forth in amended claim 9. Accordingly, amended claim 9 is unobvious under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) over Jenkins in view of Crampton.   Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 9 are requested.

Since claims 10-11 depend from amended independent claim 9, and recite additional subject matter, claims 10-11 should also be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1224.

Respectfully submitted,
    Hung-Shan Wei

By _ /Frank R. Niranjan/   Date: September 30 , 2008

        Frank R. Niranjan

Registration No.: 41,572

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (714) 626-1224

Fax No.: (714) 738-4649